

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §§ 102, 103 as unpatentable over Sales is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 1-4, 7-9 and 11-15 it is submitted that Sales does not show every feature of the claimed invention and does not, therefore anticipate the claims. The office action specifically references zones 53 and 54 as shown in figure 6 in the assertion that the taper of prisms 721 and 722 are the same. It is submitted that there is no support for this position in the Sales patent and that, instead, the patent teaches to the contrary. In particular, Sales teaches that the width of the variable-width prisms changes over the height of the refractor. (See, column 8, lines 36-41.) Thus, contrary to teaching that the prisms 721 and 722 have the same taper, it appears that they must necessarily have different tapers.

The reference in the office action to the disclosure at column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 13 appears to refer to some alternative arrangement where the interior and exterior prisms are reversed and to the use of a coating. This does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. The reference to column 7, line 59 to column 8, line 64 appears to teach contrary to the examiner's assertions, as noted above.

It is noted that claim 1 has been amended to recite that the transition zone is contiguous to the transition prisms. Thus, the reference in the office action to zones 53 and 54 on the one hand and zone 59 on the other is clearly addressed by this amendment.

Regarding, claim 3, Sales specifically teaches that the transition prisms are of a different shape than the main prisms, because their widths change continuously as noted above.

Regarding claim 7, Sales merely teaches at column 8, lines 36-40 that the change in width may be "variable and/or discontinuous," but does not suggest in any way that it can be anything but a change. Thus, this in no way teaches or suggests the invention whereby the taper of the transition prisms is the same as that of the main prisms over a major part of the shaped wall, as recited in claims 1 and 11.

With regard to claims 11-14, it is submitted that Sales has virtually nothing that teaches or suggests the claimed method.

Regarding claim 15, it is submitted that Sales does not teach that the prisms 721 and 722 have identical configurations for any part of the reflector for the reasons set forth above.

With regard to the rejection under 35 USC §103, it is submitted that Sales does not teach the general conditions of the claim, as explained above, and that the rejection should be withdrawn for at least that reason. Moreover, the limitations of claims 5, 6, and 10 have been found to provide a particularly useful reflector that is not shown or suggested by any reference of record.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any outstanding matters.

All necessary extensions of time are hereby requested. Please charge all necessary fees to deposit account 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARK & BRODY


Conrad J. Clark
Registration No. 30,340

Customer No. 22902
1090 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 250
Washington DC 20005
Telephone: 202-835-1111
Facsimile: 202-835-1755
Date: August 13, 2009